

2

CASE NO. 05-747

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

MAR 13 2006

Sophia J. Gibbons,
Petitioner,
v.

State of Florida, et al.,
Respondents.

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Sophia J. Gibbons
P.O. Box 1605
Oneco Florida
34264-1605
941-447-1457

Petitioner of the aforecited Case No. 05-747; does ask the Court to grant said Petitioner's Petition for rehearing; due to an enormous amount of extraordinary circumstances that are left unresolved and a breach of our nation's Homeland Security.

Petitioner has been severely maligned by the previous Courts, whose irrational thinking does promote terrorism. Citizens of the United States do deserve to have equal protection and that includes the Petitioner. No one has equal protection from the armed kidnappers cited herein or the murderers, whom are Defendants of this case at bar. Each and every Defendant is a national threat to our Homeland Security.. Therefore, the bigoted prior courts are not only maligning the Petitioner, but all of society.

No Court can honorably demand that a concurrent victim give up thier Fourth, Fifth and Fourteenth Amendment rights to the United States Constitution. Nor, can any court justly and fairly allow armed kidnappers and murderers to run free in our society without any prosecution by a competent court of law. If any court promotes terrorists; such court is a risk to our homeland Security...

Defendant, Donald C. Evans, has breached Homeland Security. For this reason, the courts cannot purposefully ignore fraudulent testimony found in the newly discovered classified materials, which the Petitioner timely filed in Middle District Court, as a permanent matter of record. Permanently meaning: FOREVER..... Therefore, any court's officials while under color of law (abuse of thier powers); who intentionally decide to further bar justice in the unsolved case of #81-10871; CLEARLY stand liable for thier acts of treason when issues of breached of our Homeland Security are involved.

It is time for the Court to consider the deceased victims of Defendants Raymond and Margaret Hazen, et al., thus able to refrain from more political agenda "at this time"

That particular comment came from Joe Spooner of the Defendant, Sarasota FBI Office: when Agent Spooner stated "we can't help you at this time! Since Spooner failed to interpret his deceptive lingo; the Petitioner must assume that the Defendant, Sarasota FBI would continue to conceal evidence of the "political cover-up" found in Case No. 81-10871. However, the FBI cannot conceal the evidence that it has become a breach to our national security and our Homeland Security. Thus, any court, which does not resolve the problems of Homeland Security breaches; the court becomes the problem.

Based on a variety of factors in Case No. 05-747; the remainder of the state actors constitute a breach in Homeland Security of the United States of America. For this reason, the Court must rely on the Bivens Act. The lower courts all had the duty to scrutinize the evidence, but opted to illegally deny the Petitioner a fair evidentiary hearing. That is a fundamental right of due process. Furthermore, the Petitioner states that she expects the Court to rehear this case and validly ponder the slew of Federal Questions that the Defendants and lower courts are presenting "at this time". This court has the authority to remedy the loopholes of Homeland Security breaches to ascertain justice for every act of terrorism found in Case No. 05-747.

It would behoove the Court to know that the Petitioner does not accept a tainted, fraudulent docket or hodge-podge of RICO that the lower courts have thrown at her, as another political ruse. Using the appearance of John Ashcroft after the the U.S. Attorney General's Office of Nashville, Tennessee had already legally defaulted has opened up a whole "new can of legal worms". Thus, this Court must weigh out the breaches of Homeland Security before it just tosses out prima facie evidence.

The Petitioner filed an Extraordinary Writ of Mandamus. Supreme Court of the United States lists Petitioner's Petition, as Writ of Mandamus not Extraordinary Writ of Mandamus. What's that another typo or does that constitute the U.S. Supreme Co-

urt's ruling of February 21, 2006, as void on it's face, as it reads in a different language, as that of the true writ filed by the Petitioner, a copy of which is attached herein. (regarding the Court answering the wrong type of writ.) In the event this IS ANOTHER docketing (current) error; the Court is in need of correcting it's error, which is hopefully not anothe "ambiguous twist" of the docket itself. Time will certainly tell if the Supreme Court allows it's own error to stand uncorrected.

The reason for the Petitioner filing an Extraordinary Writ in the first place is because the Petitioner has extraordinary circumstances in which justice has been illegally barred by the Defendants collectively for over two decades on-going. The Sarasota Sheriff's Deputy stated at the kidnappings scene that "money had to go under the table to do this, but don't quote me!" The U.S. SUPREME COURT should ask itself..money.. where..how much..how long....? Also, is it not a breach of Homeland Security for Defendant Evans to use the FBI Academy training to do armed kidnappings, coverups and God only knows what other treacherous acts on minor children? If the Courts do not care to rid society of it's hardened criminals then why have prisons? Again, the Court needs to ask the obvious questions about the Defendants, Hazens' perjured affidavits. Surely, the (Courts) took the time to read the killers' contradicting letter and/or evidence. Or did they?

Consequently, no court can ~~del~~ illegally bar a persons rights to due process unless it is a "crooked court." No Court can obstruct justice by deleting the usage of the New Discovery Doctrine, R.1.540(b), Bivens Act, UCCJA, PKPA, etc., etc., so as to unentertain a kidnapped victim.

When the Courts fail the victims by illegally barring justice the victim still has many legal recourses. Homeland Security should be top priority to the U.S. Supreme Court. The classified docs speak for themselves. The Jacksonville FBI is not void of knowledge and the Petitioner will be updating that office regarding this Petition for Rehearing.

Based on the obvious extraordinary circumstances cited above; the Petitioner moves the Court to grant this Petition for Renuaring and to start asserting justice to the many victims of #81-10871. The Petitioner reiterates all previous argument by the Petitioner in her cause of 05-747 and does further state at this time that high treason is high treason.

Dated this the 7th day of March, 2006.

Virginia J. Nickerson, pro se
P.O. Box 1605
Oneco, Florida
34264-1605
(941) 442-1457